

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 93 04:30:21 PDT  
From: Ham-Equip Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-equip@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Equip-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Equip Digest V93 #7  
To: Ham-Equip

Ham-Equip Digest                      Wed, 11 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue        7

Today's Topics:

    Computer Control for Scanner (2 msgs)  
    FT530 extended transmit/recieve mod file  
    FWD: DSP filters and desired features

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Equip-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Equip Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-equip".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 10 Aug 93 16:21:51 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!  
walter.cray.com!rps@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Computer Control for Scanner  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Are there any scanners that can be computer controlled? My assumption is  
that if there are they might cost big bucks.

Are there any plans for computer controlling scanners on Freq,  
and getting S meter readings from scanners? I have been thinking about  
the possibility of making a packet controlled or DTMF controlled Freq  
triangulation system to use for foxhunting and jammer locating.

Any Ideas? Has anyone done something like this?

```

---
/_ )
/ \_/_/_/_/_/_/_
rps@cray.com
(( ~|~ ))
|
|__o
```

NOMRR @ KB0GF.MN.USA.NOAM

- \<,  
0/ 0

... . -. ----- -- .-. .-. -...-. -- --... ....-- ... -.-

-----

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1993 23:54:20 -0400  
From: magnesium.club.cc.cmu.edu!news.sei.cmu.edu!bb3.andrew.cmu.edu!  
andrew.cmu.edu!dd3u+@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Computer Control for Scanner  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Excerpts from netnews.rec.radio.amateur.equipment: 10-Aug-93 Computer  
Control for Scanner by Russell P. Starksen@cray

> From: rps@cray.com (Russell P. Starksen)  
> Subject: Computer Control for Scanner  
> Date: 10 Aug 93 16:21:51 CDT  
>  
> Are there any scanners that can be computer controlled? My assumption is  
> that if there are they might cost big bucks.  
>  
> Are there any plans for computer controlling scanners on Freq,  
> and getting S meter readings from scanners? I have been thinking about  
> the possibility of making a packet controlled or DTMF controlled Freq  
> triangulation system to use for foxhunting and jammer locating.  
>  
> Any Ideas? Has anyone done something like this?

>  
> --- (( ~|~ ))  
> /\_) rps@cray.com |  
> / \\_/\_/\_/\_/\_/\_/\_/\_ |\_\_o  
> NOMRR @ KB0GF.MN.USA.NOAM - \<,  
> ... . -. ----- -- .-. .-. -...-. -- --... ....-- ... -.- 0/ 0

AOR at 1-800-445-7717 makes bunches of scanners with really  
impressive frequency coverage.  
Some of their more expensive ones (\$500 and up) have RS-232 ports.

David Donley  
dd3u+@andrew.cmu.edu  
KD6ACL

-----

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1993 20:40:48 GMT  
From: rtech!amdahl!amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: FT530 extended transmit/recieve mod file  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

(Jon Gefaell) writes:

>  
> How many times do you think this needs to be posted before people can  
> be bothered to take the time and effort to read the fine FAQ's and use  
> the fine FTP sites and Gophers they mention?  
>  
> Yeah, right... maybe not, huh?

Many, many, many, many times. Every time I post the 470 or 5100/5200  
mods list, I get swamped by "thank-you" notes from people who  
apparently didn't even know the mods lists existed.

[and yes, Virginia, I will e-mail the mods list(s) if someone can't  
find them via FTP]

Brian McMinn N5PSS brian.mcminn@amd.com

-----  
Date: 10 Aug 93 17:41:28 MDT  
From: agate!dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!slp9m@ames.arpa  
Subject: FWD: DSP filters and desired features  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Dear DXer and Contester Users and Potential Users of DSP filters,

(If someone could post this on any other appropriate reflectors  
(other than CQ-CONTEST reflector), I would appreciate it.)

I have had a JPS NIR-10 filter since the product first came out. I have  
not yet upgraded to the latest firmware, but feel that its best feature  
is the automatic removal of multiple carriers. At Dayton this year I  
purchased a Timewave Technology DSP-59. I was very impressed with its  
automatic removal of carriers as well as its noise reduction and LP/HP  
filter capability, and of its intuitive control operation, especially  
the "aggressiveness of the correlation function" adjustment.

I have also been one of the beta sites for the Digital Interactive  
DSP-120 filters. Comparing it to the others is a classic apples and  
oranges comparison. The DSP-120 has digital record and playback on  
the host computer (which it requires for many of its functions and  
the other filters do not use a host computer), as well as a graphics  
screen display on your computer for filter selection and changing,  
and a time domain and frequency domain display. Because of the DSP-120's  
wide range of features and computer interface it is somewhat more  
difficult to master than the other two which have only knobs and switches  
(especially in a contest on Sunday at 4 a.m. local or anytime when the QSO  
rate is high). But the DSP-120 lacks the capability of automatic reduction  
of multiple carriers that I find quite useful on phone. (In fact my normal

operation involves leaving any DSP engine in the automatic removal mode for all general operating.) (When the Timewave Technology DSP-59 is switched to carrier removal mode and it is used on CW, its operation is so fast that only the leading edges of the dots and dashes get through -- very impressive.) (The Digital Interactive DSP-120 has an adaptive filter function that when turned on integrates the spectral components over whatever time you let it run and designs a matched filter that corresponds to the individual's voice to which it was listening -- impressive indeed.)

The designer of the DSP-120 is not an amateur radio operator (the filter has a number of non-ham applications) and relies on feedback from users for adding and prioritizing new features. I feel that the automatic removal of carriers is an important feature, maybe even a fundamental feature, and that the lack of this capability reduces the usefulness (and marketability) of the DSP-120.

So, I am requesting any input from both users of DSP filters as well as potential users regarding usefulness of various functions on the currently available filters, as well as a "wish list" for features to be included in the next generation of DSP filters. Especially interested in "correlation function" types of filtering, where highly correlated signals (such as carriers) are rejected, low correlation signals (such as noise) are rejected, and moderately correlated signals (such as voice) are passed through.

Reply to me directly or via the reflector as appropriate (per Trey's guidelines). I am at broz@csn.org

Thanks for the input! John Brosnahan W0UN

--

forwarded to USENET by...

-----  
Scott E. Parker WA7VYJ  
Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences  
Utah State University Logan, UT 84322-4405  
Internet: sparker@coquina.cass.usu.edu sparker@cedar.hao.ucar.edu  
Twisted pair: 801-750-2975 (USU) 801-750-2992 (FAX) 801-753-3924 (home)

-----  
End of Ham-Equip Digest V93 #7  
\*\*\*\*\*